



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The

American Historical Review

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION AT MADISON

MADISON is a city of much quiet beauty and social attractiveness. It is well fitted for a meeting of a national historical association by the presence of a university community, with a historical faculty of well-known eminence, and by the possession of commodious academic buildings, and especially of an historical library famous for its beauty and its treasures, the most sumptuous home which history enjoys anywhere in America. Thus on the one hand there was much to attract a large number of the members of the Association to the twenty-third annual meeting. On the other hand, though the western membership of the Association is now somewhat greater than the eastern, Madison is not quite central even to the former, while to eastern members it would seem remote; and the railroads, which in former years have deemed it for their interest to make considerable reductions in fares on such occasions, chose this year to take a different view. Therefore the registered attendance, which was 280 at the Chicago meeting of 1904, 276 at that held in Baltimore and Washington, and 280 at Providence, was but 214 at Madison. There was however no lack of numbers, in view of the presence of the American Economic Association, the American Political Science Association, the American Sociological Society, the American Association for Labor Legislation, and the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, and attendance by persons not members of any of these societies. Of the proceedings of these other organizations we as usual attempt no record; most of them have organs in which such records are presented. It may suffice to say that their programmes seemed not only rich and varied, but of marked practical utility; and that many

students of history, or teachers whose fields of work embrace more than that science alone, welcomed the opportunity of attending parts of the exercises of the allied societies.

Two drawbacks, and perhaps only two, presented themselves to the minds of the Executive Council when a meeting at Madison was first contemplated. It is not a city of large and excellent hotels, and it is subject to the chances involved in the northwestern climate. Kind Heaven showed favor to the historical forces in the latter respect, bestowing mild days of remarkable beauty, which the most austere scientific mind need not disdain to reckon among the *memorabilia* of the meeting; and the lack of hotels was compensated, or rather turned into a theme of rejoicing, by the abundant hospitality of the academic and other residents of Madison, who exhausted all the means which kindness, ingenuity and organizing ability could suggest, to make the visitors comfortable in fraternity houses, dormitories and private houses. A luncheon at the Woman's Building, a "smoker" at the University Club, and many private entertainments were offered. Special exhibitions of early maps and western manuscripts, of early newspapers and of material for the history of labor and socialism in America, were arranged in the Historical Building, in which most of the sessions of the American Historical Association were held.

The first session, which was a joint meeting with the American Political Science Association, was held on Friday evening in Assembly Hall. In the absence from Madison of President Van Hise, Dean Edward A. Birge of the College of Letters and Science welcomed the associations on the part of both the state and the university. After noting several parallel developments in the organization and aims of workers in the physical sciences and in history, he showed how both were learning to shape their ideas into instruments of public service as well as of the higher learning.

The inaugural address of the President of the American Historical Association, Professor J. Franklin Jameson of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, entitled "The American Acta Sanctorum", has been printed in the January number of this journal.¹

Mr. Frederick N. Judson of St. Louis, President of the American Political Science Association, delivered an inaugural address on "The Future of Representative Government".² He spoke of the existing tendency to diminish the importance and dignity of the

¹ XIII. 286-302.

² Since printed, in the *American Political Science Review* for February, 1908.

legislature through constitutional enactment and judicial annulment, while on the other hand the power of the executive is increasing, and the boards and commissions that represent it also exercise legislative and judicial power. Referring to the popular distrust of the representative system as shown by the agitation in favor of the initiative and referendum, he discussed the advantages and disadvantages of these proposed remedies. Distrust is caused by the abuse of lobbying, which the growth of corporations tends to develop, and by the abuses of party management. Measures for reform, such as the laws abolishing the principle of representation in party nominations, decrease in the number of elected municipal officials, and proportional or minority representation were considered. The system of representation must be made more truly representative and the character of representatives, which our commercialism tends to degrade, must be maintained through the development of a public spirit ready to make sacrifices.

The second session, held on Saturday morning, consisted of two conferences. That on the Relation of Geography and History was largely attended and aroused great interest. Professor Frederick J. Turner of the University of Wisconsin presided. In the first paper Miss Ellen Churchill Semple of Louisville, Kentucky, discussed "Geographical Location as a Factor in History". Her main conclusions were as follows: The location of a country is the supreme geographical fact in its history. The dispersion of a people over a wide, boundless area has a disintegrating tendency, while the opposite result follows concentration within a restricted national base. A people situated between two other peoples generally forms an ethnical and cultural link between the two. The unifying effect of vicinal location is greatly enhanced if the neighboring people are grouped about an enclosed sea. An even closer connection exists between adjoining nations united by ties of blood and economically dependent upon one another because of a contrast in physical conditions. The two chief types of continuous location are the central and peripheral. The former means opportunity for widening territory and the exercise of a wide-spread influence, but it also means danger; the latter means a narrow base but a protected frontier along the sea. All nations strive to combine both a central and a peripheral location. An admirable combination of the two is in the United States; but our country has paid for its security by an historical aloofness and poverty of influence. The accessibility of the maritime periphery tends to raise it in culture, wealth, density of

population, and often in political importance, in advance of the centre. It blends diverse over-sea influences and passes them on to the interior. Each inland frontier has to reckon with a different neighbor and an undivided influence of varying historical importance. Location is the geographical factor in history most subject to the vicissitudes attending the anthropo-geographical evolution of the earth—the transfer of the seats of civilization.

The second paper, by Professor Orin Grant Libby of the University of North Dakota, dealt with "Physiography as a Factor in Community Life". To indifference in physiography as well as in education and religion he ascribed the early national leadership of Virginia and the provincialism of New England. But his principal illustrations were drawn from North Dakota. Here the Mandans, in the rich and sheltered valley of the Missouri, developed a civilization superior to that of any other Indians of the Northwest; while the Chippewa or Ojibway tribe, migrating from the Great Lakes to the Turtle Mountain Plateau, lost many of their arts and degenerated to a lower plane of culture. The method and character of the white occupation of the state was predetermined by its physiography. Its double drainage system—the Missouri and Red Rivers—made it a battle-ground of rival fur companies and of contending nationalities, whose rivalry for the Indian trade led to Lord Selkirk's settlement near Winnipeg, which brought the first white settlers into the state. The results of these physiographic conditions and the consequent fur-trade occupation of the state were: the perpetuation of nomadic life and the delayed development of agriculture, due to the presence of the buffalo herd; the long retention by England of the Red River valley and the establishment of forts by the United States government; the numerous half-breed population, due to the long occupation of the state by Indian tribes and resident trading companies; and the ignoring of international boundary lines in favor of larger physiographic boundaries.

The discussion of the morning's papers was opened by Professor George L. Burr of Cornell, who argued that geography, though a factor in history, is only a factor, and that no more in history than in mathematics can the outcome be inferred from a single factor alone. Though all that man does and is be but the product of himself into his environment, it must never be forgotten that he too is a factor, and oftener the active than the passive, the multiplier than the multiplicand. Recognition of this is often obscured by an ambiguous or inexact use of words. Thus "location" may denote

either an act or the result of an act; it may mean a placing or a place. When Miss Semple tells us that "the most important geographical fact in the past history of the United States has been their location on the Atlantic opposite Europe" we are in danger of forgetting that she speaks, not of a condition, but of an achievement—for what has made the story of the colonists other than that of the aborigines is not geographical position, but their European birth and training, their ships and their compass, the friends they left behind and the habits which engendered their trade. To impute action or causation, influence or control, to things which are inert is a figure of speech which gives vigor to style, but which always involves a fallacy; and when to nature is imputed what is planned and achieved by man, the sufferer from the fallacy is history.

Dr. Harlan H. Barrows, instructor in the University of Chicago, defended a position intermediate between that of Miss Semple and that of Professor Burr.

Professor Ulrich B. Phillips of the University of Wisconsin exhibited two maps that illustrated the relation of geography and history. One map showed the location of the white and negro population in the South in 1850; the other, the distribution of Whig and Democratic votes in presidential elections in 1848. In the lower South the Whig majorities were situated in the Black Belt, the region of the great plantations, which developed an aristocratic spirit antagonistic to the principles of Jacksonian democracy, and up to 1860 cast their votes in the interest of the Union. In the upper South the distribution of the Whigs is explained by other causes, such as the desire for internal improvements, for the tariff, strong states'-rights feeling, etc.

Professor Ralph S. Tarr, President of the American Geographical Society, and Professor George B. Adams of Yale University, returning to the discussion of the first two papers, suggested that disagreement was caused partly by lack of definition of terms. Professor H. Morse Stephens of the University of California, Professor N. M. Trenholme of the University of Missouri and Miss Semple also took part in the discussion, the last-named answering objections which had been raised against the arguments which she had advanced, and completing them in points in which they had been misunderstood.

The other conference of Saturday morning was the usual gathering to discuss the problems of state and local historical societies. Mr. Frank H. Severance of the Buffalo Historical Society

was its chairman. Its secretary, Professor Evarts B. Greene of the University of Illinois, read a careful report on the year's progress in the work of the societies, reviewing the legislation of the year for historical work, the appropriations made, the other additions to the resources of the societies, the additions to their buildings and equipment and to the series of their publications, and dwelling also on significant new enterprises undertaken by some of them. He reported much increase in the appropriations made in the middle West for historical purposes, and forcibly advocated better planning of what to do with the appropriations, completer care in the avoidance of waste and duplication, fuller co-operation among societies and better editing.

The foremost topic of discussion in the conference was "The Co-operation of State Historical Societies in the Gathering of Material in Foreign Archives". Doctor Dunbar Rowland, the director of the Department of Archives and History in Mississippi, reviewed the relation of the societies to the archives of Great Britain, France and Spain, and the nature of the materials to be found in the latter; read the instructions which he had given to searchers and copyists in Seville; discussed concrete measures for the avoidance of unnecessary duplication (it was admitted that some duplication is necessary) by the preparation and circulation of calendars founded on preliminary searches; and proposed the formation of a committee of seven to deal with this matter.

Professor Clarence W. Alvord, who has lately become the chief historical adviser to the Illinois State Historical Library, emphasized the special importance of such measures to the West and especially to the societies of the Mississippi Valley. If each such society draws off from the archives of Spain or France all that in any sense relates to its territory, there is much duplication, on account of the originally undivided character of this region; if on the other hand each takes only that which in the strictest sense belongs to it, large masses of material relating to the whole valley will be left untouched. There should be more systematic planning for their volumes, so that we may know what we are likely to find in each. He described four possible plans of action: a close federation of the Western historical societies, with a central committee, publishing one general collection; a looser federation with four minor groups, each preparing publications for its particular section; a division of Western history into periods, with an arrangement whereby each society should deal with all the

general materials relating to the period assigned to it; and, less completely effective, but less likely to encounter obstacles in the local pride of states or societies, a central committee of information, with a clearing-house at the Carnegie Institution or the Library of Congress. A committee of seven to canvass the whole matter was appointed by the chairman of the conference. Mr. Rowland was designated as chairman of the committee; the other members are Messrs. W. C. Ford, E. B. Greene, J. F. Jameson, T. M. Owen, B. F. Shambaugh and R. G. Thwaites.

This may be the most appropriate point at which to speak of the formation of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, which was organized at Madison during the period of the meeting chronicled in this article. Its executive committee consists of Dr. Thomas M. Owen as president, Professor Clarence W. Alvord as vice-president, Mr. Clarence S. Paine as secretary and treasurer, Dr. Reuben G. Thwaites and Mr. George W. Martin. The object of this new society, which it is understood will stand in some relation of affiliation to the American Historical Association, is to promote mutual consultation among the officers and members of the various organizations already existing and to care in other ways for the interests of special work in the history of this western region. It may be expected that whatever plans are suggested as advisable by the committee named above may find their best means of execution through this new association, which will be able to exercise upon the state historical agencies a strong influence in favor of whatever measures of co-operation may commend themselves to the new organization. The latter, it is expected, will consist largely of officers of the existing and more local bodies.

Next in the proceedings of the conference, Miss Lucy M. Salmon, professor in Vassar College, read a paper on "Scientific Organization of Historical Museums". The speaker outlined the reasons why museums are often lightly esteemed: chiefly lack of judgment in selecting material and lack of skilled curators. There is need of specialization in the establishment of museums. After enumerating and describing various types the speaker urged that a museum should represent a single idea, not a miscellaneous collection of objects. In the case of historical museums we have concentrated too much attention on manuscript material. We should try to preserve objects characteristic of each region or of each stage of development—the log-cabin, the plantation, the red schoolhouse. Curators should have many natural qualifications, and should be trained for their work.

Mr. Julian P. Bretz, instructor in the University of Chicago, emphasized the need of historical museums in colleges and universities, and made a special point of the fact that there should be a direct connection between the museum and research. Museums should aim to offer opportunities for research. The principles which are guiding the development of the historical museum of the University of Chicago were pointed out. Relics and curiosities are discarded. The purpose is to establish additional means of preserving material, and to gather educational objects such as facsimiles, maps and broadsides, which may become a valuable teaching adjunct. The difference between historical and industrial museums was discussed.

A paper on "Co-operation of Local Historical Societies" by Mr. John F. Ayer, secretary of the Bay State Historical League, was read by the secretary of the conference. The Bay State League is a union of local historical societies in Massachusetts. The great success which has attended its formation was enlarged upon. The main results secured were increased interest, opportunity to exchange views and papers, a widening of the field of work of individual societies and an increased membership.

The session of Saturday evening, a general session of the association, was devoted to papers in European History. In the opening paper, entitled "The Programme of a Puritan State", Professor Herbert D. Foster of Dartmouth College discussed the contributions to Puritanism made by five documents adopted by Geneva between the years 1536 and 1541. Of these, the first edition of Calvin's *Institutes* insisted upon man's moral obligation as a plain deduction from the fundamental premise of the sovereignty of God and of his Word; it provided for training in and enforcement of morals, and safeguarded both liberty and law. Calvin rendered service to modern liberty, first, by pointing out the divinely ordained duty of constitutional representatives of the people to "moderate the power of kings"; secondly, by training men with the moral poise and power necessary for constitutional revolution and representative government. In 1537 the first steps toward the formation of a Puritan state in Geneva were taken by a partial adoption of the "Articles concerning the Organization of the Church" and by the enforcement of a Biblical Confession of Faith as a test of citizenship and church membership. In the catechism printed by the state, Calvin provided a training and test for the admission of children to the church, and in his system of discipline and excom-

munication a training and pruning of its adult membership. When the Caesaropapist state infringed on the church's liberty of preaching and ceremonies, Calvin and Farel illustrated the Puritan temper in preferring exile to violation of the "Word of God". The "Ecclesiastical Ordinances" enacted by Geneva on Calvin's recall mark the nominal adoption of a systematic organization of the religious and moral life of the little republic under the co-operative control of a church and a state which possessed distinct jurisdictions but acknowledged one authority—the Word of God. The programme marked by these five documents bred the Puritan temper.

The next paper, on "Legazpi and Philippine Colonization", was read by Mr. James A. Robertson of Madison. He first compared with the four preceding expeditions to the Philippines, the expedition of Legazpi, despatched in 1564 under orders to colonize the islands for Spain, although they lay within Portugal's demarcation. He then gave an account of the highest officers of the expedition, Legazpi, long a resident of Mexico, and Urdaneta, the chief navigator, one of the five Augustinians who accompanied him. He set forth the difficulties that Legazpi encountered—famine, mutiny, and the hostility and treachery of the Portuguese as well as of the natives. But in spite of dangers and of the neglect of both Spain and New Spain, Legazpi accomplished his task. At the time of his death in 1572 the great pioneer, ably seconded by his officers and the friars, had established the settlements of Cebú and Manila; had removed in great measure the distrust of the natives; had explored and pacified much of the island territory; had established trade with the natives as well as with the Chinese; had arrested the progress of Mohammedanism, which had extended as far as Manila; and had laid the broad lines of Spanish administration in the Philippines. Legazpi's claim to greatness does not rest in the origination of colonial principles, but in the manner in which he carried out his instructions; in his loyalty to king and cause; in his independence of action and freedom from domination by the friars; in his resources, humanity, integrity, patience, prudence and tact. Industry and the family were, he saw clearly, the foundations of a permanent colony. His conquest and colonization were essentially peaceful.

Dr. Roger B. Merriman, instructor in Harvard University, read a paper on "The Elizabethan Government and the English Catholics: Another Phase of the Question", which is printed in subsequent pages of this journal. Professor James Westfall Thompson of the University of Chicago followed with a paper entitled

“Some Economic Factors in the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes” which we are to have the privilege of printing in a later issue.

In the concluding paper of the session Professor Wilbur C. Abbott of the University of Kansas treated of “The Beginning of English Political Parties”. The earliest party divisions after the Restoration bore religious names but were really political, Anglican and Presbyterian. The former first gained ascendancy under Clarendon. Their programme was a stronger, though still Parliamentary, royal power, restricted personal liberties, relief of the landed classes in taxation, occupation with domestic concerns, and strict conformity. Against them the Presbyterians stood for toleration. The king, desiring royal indulgence for Catholicism, drew together a part of his friends, soon known as the Courtiers. These stood for toleration by prerogative, protection, personal liberty and vigorous foreign policy. By 1667 they overthrew Clarendon, but the ensuing ministry, the nonconformist Cabal, alienated the opposition; now known as Country Gentlemen, by their tolerance for the Catholics and reliance on prerogative. In 1670 the royal intrigues divided the Cabal into Catholic and Protestant sections. The struggle increased, and culminated in events surrounding the second Dutch war, 1672–1674. The Test Act was passed, eliminating the Catholics. Shaftesbury was dismissed and joined the triumphing Country Party, and the court was reorganized under Danby. By 1674 the organization, methods and issues were fully defined. For the court, greater executive power, French alliance, conformity, prerogative, stood out as essentials; for the country, greater power of the legislature, freedom of Parliament and personal liberty, anti-French policy. Thereafter save in details these did not change in spite of the excesses on either side. Whig and Tory were practically in existence, save for the name, by 1674.

The session of Monday morning was given up to five separately-organized discussions of special fields of work, “round-table” conferences of actual workers, all held at the same time. Useful as they proved in several instances, the want of a distinction in their proceedings between the work of teaching and that of research was apparent. It was also noticeable that, though free discussion had been chiefly intended, set papers prevailed. The five fields discussed were those of medieval European history, modern European history, Oriental history and politics, the constitutional history of the United States, and United States history since 1865, respectively.

The discussion on Medieval European History was opened by

the chairman, Professor G. L. Burr, who commented on the difficulties of teaching the American child the history of other lands in other times, and stated the question proposed for consideration: How should medieval history be written and taught for Americans?

Professor J. H. Robinson of Columbia University, in an entertaining talk, declared that a course in medieval history offers the grand opportunity "to leave things out". The Middle Ages are needed for explanatory purposes; they should be studied and taught to show "how things came about" rather than to show "how things were". Applying this test, the period from Gregory the Great to Abelard has, he thought, "all the darkness and gloom usually attributed to it", and should be skipped. The emphasis put upon that period hitherto is due to the "vicious perspective" of the Germans. Not even the age of Charlemagne was excepted when Professor Robinson proposed that everything from Gregory to Abelard should be introductory and that modern history should begin with Abelard and be traced thereafter as a steady development.

Professor Munro of Wisconsin felt that the first speaker, and modern historians generally, wished to carry modern history back too far, and declared himself content with the common division of history between medieval and modern. Still he had no sympathy with studying only that which is peculiar to the Middle Ages, but advocated the study of that which the Middle Ages have in common with modern times. Thus he would omit much, but nothing that is essential, and therefore would not and could not skip the period from Gregory to Abelard. He stated with emphasis that the thing of first importance is to teach medieval history so as to make it applicable to modern conditions. He also maintained that, as medieval history is usually the first college course in history, it must give the student something of method as well as of historical fact. In general agreement with these opinions was the paper read by Professor Dow of Michigan.

Professor Haskins of Harvard conceded that there must be omissions in teaching the medieval period, but could not countenance skipping the period from Gregory to Abelard. "We may run, but not jump." The fact that American students are more interested in the late, than in the early Middle Ages makes Professor Haskins willing to hasten over the earlier parts. He believes this preference of students for the later period attributable to their liking for biography which the early Middle Ages do not satisfy; and he has encouraged the reading of biography in his course at Harvard.

Professor Haskins also commented upon the variety of interests and demands which students bring to their courses and advocated such a presentation of the course, whether by lecture, discussion, assigned readings, or other method, that there be something for everybody; a course in medieval history should stimulate a student to variety of reading and should give "background"

Professor Thompson of the University of Chicago also objected to skipping the centuries from Gregory to Abelard. They are centuries not only of decadence but also—and this is the all-important fact—of formation of new institutions; and, if the decadence is unworthy of study, the formative processes cannot be ignored, especially not by the student of modern history. Considered in this light it is difficult to see why modern history, even if near at hand, should be considered more enlightening than medieval history.

Professor Harding of Indiana came to the support of the study of the differences between medieval and modern history and claimed for it an educational value not to be despised. He further contended that generalizations should be avoided in teaching history, and that all instruction should be concrete. The general discussion was participated in by Professor Scott of Chicago Theological Seminary, Professor Richardson of Beloit College and Professor Flick of Syracuse.

The second conference was devoted to Modern European History. Professor Guy Stanton Ford of the University of Illinois presided. The first paper was read by Professor Ralph C. H. Catterall of Cornell University, who discussed the extent to which work in modern European history could be carried on in this country and maintained that for the making of monographs nine-tenths of the material desired could be obtained here. He spoke of the difficulties met in working in the history of any foreign country, the want of sympathetic comprehension on the part of those not native born and the lack, even, of intellectual comprehension, as illustrated by the efforts of the English in writing on the French Revolution. Mr. Catterall maintained that notwithstanding this the field was an excellent one for Americans and that the difficulties described could be met in part by travel. He then compared the library facilities of America with those of Europe and urged that all the material available should be thoroughly studied here before the student goes abroad. The extent of the collections at Cornell for the study of the French Revolution were described at some length and the way was thus prepared for two suggestions: that

a good description of the valuable collections in each of the American universities be made so that a student might know where to look for the best material on any subject in modern European history; and that each university library devote itself to a special field of collection and avoid duplicating the work of other universities.

The paper was discussed by Professor Charles A. Beard of Columbia University, by Professor G. S. Ford and by Professor Frank M. Anderson of the University of Minnesota. Professor Beard sought to define more closely the "division of labor" advocated for university libraries. Professor Ford discussed our special advantages as outsiders and suggested that it might devolve upon Americans to furnish general histories of Europe. He maintained that we could go beyond monographic work and attempt that which is synthetic. Professor Anderson followed in the same sense.

The second paper, prepared by Professor Fred M. Fling, of the University of Nebraska, and read in his absence by Dr. Christophelsmeyer, dealt with the tradition that seminary work in America on subjects in modern European history is impossible. Mr. Fling maintained that lack of material for this purpose could not be urged and demonstrated the manner in which a working library on the period just preceding the French Revolution and for the French Revolution had been collected at the University of Nebraska. This was followed by a full explanation of the method employed in the seminars at Nebraska, the subjects considered and the results obtained. Professor C. A. Beard read a paper arguing in favor of a greater study of contemporary history and advocating the establishment of a journal of contemporary history to be published twice a year. This journal should show where the latest documents are to be found and indicate the most recent works on contemporary affairs. For a more general magazine of modern European history he saw no opportunity. The paper read by Professor H. G. Plum of the University of Iowa advocated a greater emphasis on the study of the economic factors in European history, and illustrated his point by reference to the economic factors in the history of the Reformation and in the period of Elizabeth. The paper was discussed briefly by Dr. Eckhardt of the University of Missouri. Professor E. D. Adams of Leland Stanford University next made a plea for a more thorough study of the connections of American history with contemporary European history. Though such study had been undertaken for a few aspects of American history, there were still many in which these connections remained unstudied and imper-

fectly understood. His illustrations dealt with the relations of England and the United States in the matter of the West Indian trade and with the connection between British emancipation in the West Indies and Nullification in South Carolina. The last paper of the session was prepared by Professor Robert M. Johnston of Bryn Mawr College, and was read by Dr. Eckhardt. Mr. Johnston advocated measures designed to prevent the teaching of generalizations in the schools and suggested a greater study of historical geography as a substitute for general statements commonly advanced in the text-books.

At the conference on Oriental History and Politics Professor Archibald Cary Coolidge of Harvard University presided. The opening paper by Dr. Arthur I. Andrews, instructor in Simmons College, was an account, based on official information, of the courses in Oriental history offered in American universities. So far as ascertained no courses in Asiatic history are required. Of courses that are elective for both graduate and undergraduate students, a considerable number deal with the history of Western Asia in the Middle Ages, including courses upon the life of Mohammed, on the spread of Islam, on the crusades, on the caliphates and on Byzantine history. There are several courses upon Western Asia in modern times, especially upon the history of the Ottoman Turks, and upon the Nearer Eastern Question. The history of Middle Asia appears to be separately treated in only one course, on Persia and India. Practically all of the courses relative to Eastern Asiatic history are concerned with the modern period. Several institutions offer graduate work in Asiatic history. With two or three exceptions, no university offers any one general course or any system of courses planned to cover the whole field of Asiatic history.

Professor Dennis of the University of Wisconsin spoke of the need of courses giving a general survey of Asiatic history, and of the necessity of relating Oriental history to Greek history; the history of Central Asia to that of Western Asia; and the earlier to the modern period.

Dr. Charles D. Tenney, ex-president of Pei Yang College, read a thoughtful paper relative to China, in which after recounting the various reasons for our neglect of Chinese history, and setting forth the immense importance of the recent formal adoption by China of modern Western education, science and political ideals, he urged the necessity of studying the history and characteristics of

Asiatics. Progress or stagnation in race development, he said, is due to complex causes quite aside from ability. The arrested development of language in China is due to the too early production of a literature so valuable that it held the written symbols to their ancient rude forms. The early writers diverted the whole mental energy of the race into literature and abstract thought, and have kept it out of the channels of material science; but the Mongolian race will soon enter into our whole heritage. We must study their history and institutions to prepare us for readjustments in our international relationships.

In the absence of Dr. Kan-Ichi Asakawa, instructor in Yale University, his paper on Japan was read by Dr. Hiram Bingham. Dr. Asakawa pointed out the practical political need and the theoretical interest of a better knowledge of the Orient. After briefly sketching the various stages of Japanese political development, and the corresponding periods of her moral and spiritual growth, each with its own forms of art and modes of life presenting many interesting problems, he passed to a discussion of historical sources. While only half-a-dozen important sources of Japanese history have been translated, some degree of reliable knowledge may be obtained through the works of Brinkley, Mazelière, Papinot and Wenckstern, and the publications of learned societies. The collections of Japanese historical sources in the original language now in the Library of Congress in Washington and in the library of Yale University are larger and better than at any other places outside Japan.

Dr. Vickars discussed the obstacles that confront the student of Japanese history—sources are largely in manuscript, are widely scattered and have been sophisticated, history having been written not as it was but as the rulers wished it to be written. In response to a question from the chair, Dr. Tenney explained that what had been said of the unauthentic character of Japanese historical sources did not apply to those in China. Chinese scholars had the scientific spirit of Confucius, who excluded the miraculous, and they possessed great critical skill. Yet there existed unauthorized histories which included the miraculous.

The fourth conference, on the Constitutional History of the United States, was presided over by Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin of the University of Chicago. Professor William MacDonald of Brown University, who spoke informally on the use of constitutional decisions in the teaching of constitutional history,

strongly recommended that the reading required of students should include the full texts of many reports of constitutional decisions, which show the processes by which the final opinion is reached and often contain valuable historical summaries not obtainable elsewhere. Decisions of the Supreme Court are the best summaries of what the people have thought on questions at issue, and in the long run faithfully reflect public opinion. The teacher of constitutional history should be a fair constitutional lawyer and should require of his students a fair mastery of the essentials of some such treatise as Cooley's *Principles of Constitutional Law*. In a course in constitutional history however, as compared with one in constitutional law, emphasis should be placed on development. Attention was called to the limitations of court decisions, which for example tend to ignore economic aspects. The discussion was participated in by Professors McLaughlin, Edward S. Corwin of Princeton University, Theodore C. Smith of Williams College and George W. Knight of Ohio State University, some of whom expressed the opinion that so detailed a study of cases as Professor MacDonald had urged, overemphasized the importance of this form of material. Professor Smith believed that in the study of the Civil War and Reconstruction, for example, legislation and constitutional enactments were more important.

Professor William E. Dodd of Randolph-Macon College developed two points: the origin of the Jeffersonian following in Virginia and the influence of the study of Coke on Littleton and of Blackstone on the particularist and nationalist interpretations of the Constitution respectively. He showed how before 1776 Patrick Henry had built up in the state a strong democratic and colonial rights party, of which Jefferson managed to place himself at the head, and which sustained him in his later reform movements in the state, as well as in his later national career. Up to about 1770 Coke on Littleton, which tends to magnify the local at the expense of the central power of the state, had been used exclusively by the Virginia lawyers at William and Mary College. Blackstone's *Commentaries*, which emphasized the sovereign power in the state as reposed in the crown, reached America in the early seventies and displaced Coke on Littleton. Marshall was trained in Blackstonian law and thought, and when he came to interpret the Constitution favored the national at the expense of the state government. Jefferson, Madison, Henry and Roane were influenced by Coke on Littleton in the opposite direction, and were able by their command

of the popular party to make Virginia almost overwhelmingly favorable to states' rights.

Professor Corwin in support of Professor Dodd's hypothesis cited a letter of Jefferson in 1826 in which he deplores the displacement of Coke on Littleton by Blackstone. Blackstone was however used also by those who favored states' rights. What he emphasized was sovereignty. One school found this in the central government, the other in the states. Professor Corwin proceeded to discuss the influence of the doctrine of natural rights on court decisions. He cited numerous cases to prove that the courts are tending more and more to invoke the doctrine of natural rights in passing on the validity of legislative enactments. He found that the doctrine is most frequently invoked in behalf of propertied interests, that is, as a conservative weapon.

Professor Ernst Freund of the University of Chicago spoke of analogous attempts of German and English courts to find some extra-constitutional ground for determining upon the validity of legislation. In the United States the courts are striving to prevent legislative autocracy. The doctrine of natural rights has been invoked frequently in this attempt, but it is doubtful whether any clear principle can be found to harmonize the increasing number of decisions involving extra-constitutional appeals, such as Professor Corwin had endeavored to show.

United States History since 1865 was the subject of the fifth conference, over which Professor James A. Woodburn of Indiana University presided. The first paper, on the United States as a Peace Power, was read by Professor Amos S. Hershey of Indiana University. The speaker showed that in the main the United States has been a peace power from the time of the Jay Treaty to the Hague Conference. We were credited with fifty-seven cases of arbitration, of which twenty had been with Great Britain. The efforts of the late Secretary Hay towards securing the open-door policy in China and its territorial integrity; the work of President Roosevelt in connection with the Treaty of Portsmouth; and the important part played by the United States at the Hague Conference in advocating a high court of justice, a general treaty of arbitration and a plan for a periodical conference, mark our growth as a peace power; while freedom from duplicity and avarice has been shown by the return of the indemnity to China.

Professor Carl Russell Fish of the University of Wisconsin concluded from his experience as a teacher that the passions engendered

by the Civil War made it impossible at present to deal satisfactorily with the later years. He believed however that it was desirable to make the attempt, and outlined various methods that he had tried. The lack of well-edited sources prevented the use of this period for good training-courses or as a means of developing the critical faculty.

Professor Frank H. Hodder of the University of Kansas read a paper on the Johnson-Grant correspondence, in which he urged that the real significance of this controversy had hitherto escaped the notice of historians. He thought that the quarrel was one of the most important factors that induced Grant to run for the presidency, while at the same time it secured for him the support of the radical element.

Professor John H. Latané of Washington and Lee University spoke on America as a World Power. Prior to 1898 the Monroe Doctrine found its sanction in the separateness of the European and American hemispheres. Mr. Latané maintained that the United States had never really interfered in the affairs of Europe; in cases where it had appeared to do so, a close analysis would show that the United States was directly interested in the matter. He advocated the study of diplomatic history since 1865 because the sources are easily accessible and because the passions and prejudice which mark our internal history are absent from the study of foreign relations.

Mr. William Dudley Foulke, formerly United States Civil Service Commissioner, spoke on the Civil Service since the War. He showed how valuable the competitive system had been as compared with the discretionary or patronage system of appointment, and believed that the reform had succeeded because the law had been skillfully drafted and able men had enforced and extended it.

In the discussion which followed, Professor Macy of the University of Iowa maintained that the prejudice to be overcome in the study of this period was not a reason for turning away from it. Professor Caldwell of the University of Nebraska took a similar view. The real difficulty, he held, is overabundance of material.

The last two sessions, that of Monday evening and that of Tuesday morning, were devoted to the reading of papers. Those of Monday evening related to American Economic History. Professor St. George L. Sioussat of the University of the South presented a detailed study of Economics and Politics in the Early Years of the

Jacksonian Period, which will appear in a modified form in a later number of this journal. Mr. Alfred Holt Stone, of Dunleith, Mississippi, and of Washington, followed with a paper, to be published in our July number, on "Some Problems in Southern Economic History"

Professor Frederic L. Paxson's paper on "The Pacific Railways and the Disappearance of the Frontier in America" was an attempt to show how and why the frontier disappeared in the early eighties of the nineteenth century.

The line of the frontier, generally parallel to the Atlantic seaboard, advanced regularly and gradually to the west until it halted about 1850 in the vicinity of the ninety-fifth meridian. At this time it assumed a circular form, surrounded by the Pacific states, Texas, and the first tier of trans-Mississippi states, and enclosing the Rocky Mountains and what was known as the Great American Desert. This shape and its enclosed area changed but little for a period of thirty years, but between 1880 and 1885 it suddenly collapsed, and a few years later was gone. The reason for the surprising change from a gradual to a sudden method of destruction is found in the relative infertility of the semi-arid region, which did not invite settlement within its area and acted as a barrier until the pressure upon it was strong enough to break through and cross it at a single bound. In the final period the frontier was attacked, not by the individual pioneer, but by the railroad, aided by federal land-grants. The attack was general and comprehensive. It began in 1862 in the Union and Central Pacific bills, and was continued in 1864 by the Northern Pacific, in 1866 by the Atlantic Pacific, and in 1871 by the Texas and Pacific. While the roads were under construction the Indian policy was revised and concentration upon reservations became the rule. The completion in 1869 of the Union and Central Pacific railroads split in two the area enclosed by the frontier. This was followed by the panic of 1873, which checked railway construction. But when prosperity revived about 1879 construction was resumed and five new continental routes were opened in 1882-1884. The paper traced the history of these various Pacific railways and showed how they brought the frontier abruptly to an end.

In the subsequent discussion upon the general field of these papers in American economic history, Professor W. E. Dodd dwelt upon the necessity of taking into account the personal equation in the settlement of historical problems, using as an example the

career of R. J. Walker in its effect upon the history of slavery. Dr. B. H. Meyer, of the Wisconsin Railroad Commission, emphasized the need of such special monographs as had been presented and suggested several topics for further research, such as the outbreaks of violence connected with the joining of the short railroad lines so as to form trunk lines; the rivalry among towns for transportation privileges; the rivalry among the various means of transportation; the history of waterways, etc. Professor F. W. Moore of Vanderbilt University, Professor U. B. Phillips and Professor Willcox of Cornell University also took part in the discussion.

The concluding session, held on Tuesday morning, was devoted to the reading of papers in Western History, followed by a brief, informal discussion. Professor Frank M. Anderson of the University of Minnesota read the opening paper, which treated of the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions of 1798 from the Standpoint of Western History. He argued that there is a considerable element of error in the commonly accepted ideas about the resolutions, owing to neglect of the strictly contemporaneous and western points of view. Special attention was called to the county meetings held in Kentucky and Virginia in 1798 prior to the convening of the legislatures which adopted the resolutions. The initiative in the presentation of the resolutions to the legislatures, he declared, came from these meetings rather than from Jefferson and the Republican leaders in Congress, to whom it is usually ascribed. The principal occasion for the resolutions was not the Alien and Sedition Laws, but western opposition to the eastern policy in regard to war with France. This opposition sprang largely from sectional and economic interests. Points of similarity in the two sets of resolutions, he held, have been exaggerated, while important points of difference have been overlooked. The most important constitutional questions raised by the resolutions, the nature of the federal union and the proper method of checking federal encroachment upon the reserved rights of the states, received relatively scant attention at the time, owing to the concentration of attention upon the question of peace or war and the war measures of the federal government.

The second paper, in which Professor Herbert E. Bolton of the University of Texas reported on the Material for Southwestern History in the Archives of Mexico, is printed in the present number of this journal.

In the third paper Professor Anna Heloise Abel of the Woman's College of Baltimore carefully set forth the various Proposals for an

Indian State, from 1778 to 1878. In 1778 and six years later the Indians were given permission, upon which they did not act, to form a state of their own. During many subsequent years other plans, such as colonization, removal and incorporation, were advanced. During Monroe's second term, when Indian troubles in Georgia reached a climax, the administration united the plans of removal and colonization, and advised the introduction of a governmental system of which statehood would have been the natural outcome. Congressional action was taken at the same time, looking towards the erecting of a regular territory for Indians exclusively. Under John Quincy Adams, Secretary Barbour advocated a great territorial government west of the Mississippi River, for which a bill projected by him supplied administrative machinery. Under Jackson, however, the Act of 1830 aimed at removal but not at organization or future citizenship. Dissatisfaction with the chaotic state of affairs in the western Indian country came largely from the red men themselves, who asked for a delegate in Congress. A commission, appointed in 1832 to investigate the matter, favored organization; but the bills for this, reported during several sessions, all failed, being regarded as administration measures; while some Southerners took issue on the color line. The Texas question was already beginning to be agitated, and since in case of war with Mexico the Indians might become dangerous, and since they were a menace to the western frontier, military supervision was deemed the wisest course. In spite of the promises of the government and the efforts of individuals no progress was made in the granting of political concessions, up to the close of Fillmore's administration. By that time the government was looking forward to the Kansas-Nebraska bill, to the passage of which an organization of the kind originally proposed might have proved an insurmountable obstacle. After the Civil War the building of the large railways made territorial government urgent. This the Indians opposed, believing that it would involve a mixed state, which public opinion increasingly favored. President Grant wished an exclusively Indian state, but after 1878 this idea was practically abandoned.

The fourth paper, by Mr. John C. Parish of the State Historical Society of Iowa, on "An Early Fugitive Slave Case West of the Mississippi River", has since its delivery been printed in the January number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics*. The last paper, by President Kendrick C. Babcock of the University of Arizona, dealt with "The Proprietary Towns of Arizona". He

showed how the very rapid development of the mineral resources of the Rocky Mountain region, especially in the Southwest, the large number of men employed and the great capital required by the corporations operating the mines, have combined to produce some interesting variations from the type of town found in the East or Middle West. The towns discussed are: Jerome, Bisbee, Douglas, Warren, Clifton and Morenci in Arizona, and Cananea and Sonora just over the border in Mexico. While these are not owned and managed as private estates like the English Bourneville or Pelzer, South Carolina; nor, except Warren, built according to plans and specifications, they all show some common evidences of proprietary control. The chief features of this control are four: ownership of lands and buildings used by citizens; ownership, direct or indirect, of public utilities; the company stores; and ownership or equally effective indirect control of the means of communication with the outside world. The public utilities managed by the great corporation are water supply, electric light and power systems, and telephone systems. The service is usually good and the prices moderate, for the monopoly is primarily for the company's own operations, and the supply of the utility to the town incidental. No one is compelled to trade at the company stores, but competition, while nominally free, is closely regulated by them. Except at Cananea the city or town is in each case dependent for its transportation to and from the outside world on a railroad owned directly or indirectly by one of the great mining interests, which thus has a vital grip on the town. In politics in the municipality the companies are not so greatly and immediately interested as in the county assessors, county boards of equalization and members of the territorial legislatures, which control assessments and rates of taxation. In general the companies succeed through their influence in these proprietary towns in electing men favorable to the corporate interests.

It remains to speak of the annual business meeting, which exhibited the usual impressive array of activities on the part of the Association, marked notable progress in several, and established some that are new. In accordance with a previous vote of the Association, it was announced that the annual meeting of 1908 would begin in Washington on Monday, December 28, and would continue at Richmond from December 29 to 31. On recommendation of the Executive Council, the Association voted that the meeting of 1909 should be held in New York City.

The Association accepted the recommendation of the Council in

favor of the establishment, in case satisfactory arrangements could be made, of a separate series of prize essays in charge of a regular publisher and under the auspices of the Association, to comprise essays which have won the Justin Winsor and Herbert Baxter Adams prizes. It also voted, on the Council's recommendation, to establish a commission to frame, for future series of documentary historical publications on the part of the United States government, a plan so conceived as to provide for a more methodical output and one more valuable to the historical profession. Subsequently, however, a different status has been given to this project by governmental action. President Roosevelt, acting through his Committee on Department Methods, commonly called the Keep Commission, has appointed to serve as a Committee on the Documentary Historical Publications of the United States Government the same gentlemen who were to have served the Association in this particular under appointment from the president of the Association. This committee will report to the Committee on Department Methods. The members appointed are Messrs. Worthington C. Ford, chairman, C. F. Adams, C. M. Andrews, W. A. Dunning, A. B. Hart, J. F. Jameson, A. C. McLaughlin, A. T. Mahan, and F. J. Turner. These gentlemen have accepted appointment, and a preliminary meeting for organization has been held in Washington.

The Council further reported that on request of the College Entrance Examination Board it had appointed a committee (Messrs. A. C. McLaughlin, chairman, C. H. Haskins, C. W. Mann, J. H. Robinson and James Sullivan) to consider certain questions arising out of the *Report of the Committee of Seven on History in Secondary Schools*, with special reference to the extent of the field to be covered in ancient history as a subject for admission to college, and that this committee expected to prepare a report in the course of the present year.

The treasurer's report showed net receipts of \$7,764, net expenditures of \$7,032, an increase of \$732 in the funds of the Association, and total assets of \$24,923.

The report of the Pacific Coast Branch, relating chiefly to its annual meeting held at San Francisco on November 29 and 30, was transmitted by its secretary, Professor C. A. Duniway; and Professor E. D. Adams, who was present as its representative, spoke briefly of the present condition of the Branch.

Brief reports were made by the Historical Manuscripts Commission (on the diplomatic archives of the Republic of Texas), the Public Archives Commission, the Board of Editors of this journal,

the Committee on Bibliography, the Committee on Publications, the General Committee and its conference on the work of state and local historical societies, and the editor of the "Original Narratives of Early American History" The Committee of Eight on History in Elementary Schools reported that its report was substantially ready for print. It will appear through a regular publisher in the course of 1908.

The Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize reported that it had found it necessary to divide the prize between the monograph of Dr. Edward B. Krehbiel of the University of Chicago on *The Interdict, its History and its Operation, with Especial Attention to the Time of Pope Innocent III.*, and the monograph of Dr. William S. Robertson of Western Reserve University on *Francisco de Miranda and the Revolutionizing of Spanish America*.

Complimentary resolutions of the usual character were presented and passed. The committee on nominations, Messrs. H. V. Ames, E. D. Adams and H. L. Caldwell, proposed a list of officers, all of whom were chosen by the Association. Professor George B. Adams was elected president, Professor Albert Bushnell Hart first vice-president and Professor Frederick J. Turner second vice-president. Mr. A. Howard Clark, Professor C. H. Haskins and Dr. Clarence W. Bowen were re-elected to their former positions. In the place of Professor Garrison and Dr. Thwaites, who had been thrice elected to the Executive Council, Professors Max Farrand and Frank H. Hodder were chosen.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

<i>President,</i>	Professor George B. Adams, New Haven.
<i>First Vice-president,</i>	Professor Albert Bushnell Hart, Cambridge.
<i>Second Vice-president,</i>	Professor Frederick J. Turner, Madison.
<i>Secretary,</i>	A. Howard Clark, Esq., Smithsonian Institution, Washington.
<i>Corresponding Secretary,</i>	Professor Charles H. Haskins, 15 Prescott Hall, Cambridge, Mass.
<i>Treasurer,</i>	Clarence W. Bowen, Esq., 130 Fulton Street, New York.

Executive Council (in addition to the above-named officers) :

Hon. Andrew Dickson White, ¹	Professor John Bach McMaster, ¹
President James Burrill Angell, ¹	Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, ¹
Henry Adams, Esq., ¹	Dr. J. Franklin Jameson, ¹
James Schouler, Esq., ¹	Professor Charles M. Andrews,
Professor George Park Fisher, ¹	Professor James H. Robinson,
James Ford Rhodes, Esq., ¹	Worthington C. Ford, Esq.,
Charles Francis Adams, Esq., ¹	Professor William MacDonald,
Rear-Adm. Alfred Thayer Mahan, ¹	Professor Max Farrand,
Henry Charles Lea, Esq., ¹	Professor Frank H. Hodder.
Professor Goldwin Smith, ¹	

Committees:

Committee on Programme for the Twenty-fourth Annual Meeting: Dr. J. Franklin Jameson, Carnegie Institution, Washington, chairman; Charles M. Andrews, Charles H. Haskins, John H. Latané and Ulrich B. Phillips.

Joint Local Committee of Arrangements for the Next Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association and the American Political Science Association: Joseph B. Bryan, Esq., Richmond, Va., chairman; Edwin A. Alderman, Allen C. Braxton, J. Alston Cabell, A. Howard Clark, William E. Dodd, Worthington C. Ford, John B. Henderson, Jr., J. Franklin Jameson, Carlton McCarthy, H. R. McIlwaine, Mrs. Kate Pleasants Minor, Samuel C. Mitchell, Andrew J. Montague, Charles W. Needham, Thomas W. Page, Samuel S. P. Patteson, James B. Scott, Thomas J. Shahan, William G. Stanard, Claude A. Swanson, Lyon G. Tyler and John L. Williams.

Editors of the American Historical Review: Professor George B. Adams, Yale University, chairman; George L. Burr, Albert Bushnell Hart, J. Franklin Jameson, Andrew C. McLaughlin and William M. Sloane.

Historical Manuscripts Commission: J. Franklin Jameson, Carnegie Institution, Washington, chairman; Worthington C. Ford, Herbert D. Foster, Frederick W. Moore, Thomas M. Owen and James A. Woodburn.

Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize: Professor Charles H. Hull, Cornell University, chairman; Edward P. Cheyney, John H. Latané, Claude H. Van Tyne and Williston Walker.

¹ Ex-presidents.

Public Archives Commission: Professor Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Charles M. Andrews, Clarence S. Brigham, Carl R. Fish, Herbert L. Osgood, Victor H. Paltsits and Dunbar Rowland.

Committee on Bibliography: Professor Ernest C. Richardson, Princeton University, chairman; Appleton P. C. Griffin, William C. Lane, James T. Shotwell and Wilbur H. Siebert.

Committee on Publications: Professor William A. Dunning, Columbia University, chairman; Herman V. Ames, A. Howard Clark, Charles Gross, Charles H. Haskins, Charles H. Hull, J. Franklin Jameson and Ernest C. Richardson (all *ex officio*, except the chairman).

Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize: Professor Charles Gross, Harvard University, chairman; George L. Burr, Victor Coffin, James W. Thompson and John M. Vincent. (During the absence of Professor Gross in Europe until September, 1908, Professor Burr will act as chairman of the committee.)

General Committee: Professor Evarts B. Greene, University of Illinois, chairman; Henry E. Bourne, William E. Dodd, Earle W. Dow, Charles H. Haskins, Frank H. Hodder, Susan M. Kingsbury, Franklin L. Riley, Lucy M. Salmon, Frank H. Severance, Benjamin F. Shambaugh and Frederick G. Young. *Secretary of the Conference of State and Local Historical Societies:* Walter L. Fleming.

Committee on College Entrance Requirements in History: Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin, University of Chicago, chairman; Charles H. Haskins, Charles W. Mann, James H. Robinson and James Sullivan.